

that DOI staff were tiring of the continuous lobbying on the proposal. Though there is evidence that the applicants tried unsuccessfully to delay through the White House the issuance of the denial decision, the only evidence supporting the theory that the opponents affected the timing of the decision through the White House or the DNC is Babbitt's own remark to Eckstein about Ickes on July 14, 1995.

**6. Interior Department Witnesses Deny Both Being Influenced by Political Party Affiliations and Being Aware of the Hudson Opponents' Efforts to Obtain Assistance from the DNC**

All Interior Department witnesses who were asked denied that the political party affiliation of the applicants or their opponents played any role in the consideration of the Hudson application at any stage in the process. Most denied any awareness of the affiliations. At least one witness said he assumed virtually all Indians were supportive of Democratic Administrations, if they were politically active at all. At least two witnesses reported they could recall having only one conversation explicitly about party affiliation of a person with a matter pending before the Department. The remark was made by someone who was not a decision-maker and the pending matter did not involve a gaming decision. The remark was to the effect of: "we are going to help the person anyway, even though he was not a Democrat." Robert Anderson said he knew of involvement of the Mashantucket Pequots with the DNC and some information about their contributions through his relationship with the tribal chairman, but never heard contributions discussed at Interior.

Duffy said he thought after the Feb. 8 meeting that the entire congressional delegation of Minnesota and Wisconsin opposed the casino. He recalled no mention of contributions at that meeting, but vaguely recalled a comment at another time about the level of campaign